



1987

# An Investigation Of Priorities Ascribed To The Mission And Goals Function Statements Of The Board Of Governors In California Community Colleges

Phillip Neil Laughlin  
*University of the Pacific*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds)

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Laughlin, Phillip Neil. (1987). *An Investigation Of Priorities Ascribed To The Mission And Goals Function Statements Of The Board Of Governors In California Community Colleges*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds/3046](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3046)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).

AN INVESTIGATION OF PRIORITIES ASCRIBED TO THE  
MISSION AND GOALS FUNCTION STATEMENTS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School  
University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

by  
Phillip Neil Laughlin  
May, 1987

Copyright, 1987  
Phillip Neil Laughlin

This dissertation, written and submitted by

Phillip Neil Laughlin

is approved for recommendation to the Committee  
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

Lay B. Hawley

Dissertation Committee:

TC Coleman

Chairman

William S. Paul

Shirley Jennings

Robert McRay

John H. Hume

Dated April 6, 1987

## ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

### AN INVESTIGATION OF PRIORITIES ASCRIBED TO THE MISSION AND GOALS FUNCTION STATEMENTS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Purpose: This study investigated the priorities of twelve community college constituent groups in order to determine if their priorities were consistent with function statements established by the California Community College Board of Governors in 1983. The mission function statements were: Associate Degrees, Certificate Programs, Community Services, Continuing and Community Education, General Education, Joint Programs, Remediation and Basic Skills Education, Student Services, and Transfer Education. It was hypothesized that the twelve groups would respond differently based upon the conditions under which they were ranking the function statements, that there would be differences among the districts depending upon the size of the district, and that there would be differences among the respondents on the basis of community college attendance.

Procedure: Subjects were the Board President, Chancellor, President and Superintendent, President, Academic Senate President, Student Body President, Chief Instructional Officer, Chief Student Services Officer, Chief Business Officer, Affirmative Action Officer, Director of EOPS and Public Information Officer in each of the California Community Colleges. An instrument developed by the researcher requested that each respondent complete separate rankings of the function statements under three conditions: Funding Free, Student Interest, and Conditional Funding. The respondent's personal educational experience in the

community college system was also requested. The results provided a basis for determining the priorities ascribed to the mission and goals functions by selected constituent groups, colleges of different size, and attendance at community colleges. Repeated measures analysis of variance (MANOVA) and Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test were performed for each of the nine functions under the three conditions. This procedure enabled comparison at two levels; the first level was among the three conditions, the second was among the function statements. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Duncan Multiple Range Tests pinpointed differences among the mean priority rankings within a single condition.

Conclusion: The three function statements receiving the highest priority ranking by the twelve constituent groups were Associate Degrees, Transfer Education and Certificate Programs. The results of the MANOVA analyses indicated that there were differences in respondent rankings for Associate Degrees, Community Services, General Education, Remediation and Basic Skills Education and Student Services. ANOVA analyses within conditions indicated that there were differences for Associate Degrees, Community Services, General Education, Remediation and Basic Skills Education, Student Services and Transfer Education. The results of the MANOVA and ANOVA analyses in regard to size of the district indicated overall differences only for Joint Programs. The results of the MANOVA analyses indicated no overall differences were found when community college attendance was used as an independent variable.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation is expressed to the many individuals who have made this study possible.

To the faculty of the School of Education.

To the members of the Committee for their guidance.

To my colleagues in the California Community Colleges.

To the President, Instructional Deans, and other members of the administration at San Joaquin Delta College.

And, finally, my special thanks and gratitude to Ann Zinck and Barbara Willis for their support, patience, time, expertise, assistance, endurance and encouragement. In particular the invaluable assistance and support given so enthusiastically by Barbara Willis made this study possible, for without her special skills, the survey, the many drafts, and the final composition of the study could never have happened.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
LIST OF FIGURES. . . . .	xv
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	7
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	7
Questions and Hypotheses . . . . .	9
Limitations. . . . .	10
Assumptions. . . . .	10
Definitions. . . . .	11
Significance of the Study. . . . .	15
Organization of the Study. . . . .	16
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .	17
History of the Community College in California, 1907 - 1978. . . . .	18
Extension of Secondary Schools (1900-1930). . . . .	18
Junior Colleges (1930-1950) . . . . .	20
Community Colleges (1950-1970). . . . .	21
Community Learning Centers (1970 - 1984) . . . . .	22
The Post Proposition 13 Community College. . . . .	23
Mission in Post-Proposition 13 Era. . . . .	25
Specific Mission and Goals Functions in the Post Proposition 13 Era . . . . .	27



TABLE OF CONTENTS  
(continued)

	Page
The Master Plan Study of Mission. . . . .	32
Specific Mission and Goals Functions in the Master Plan Study. . . . .	38
The Joint Legislative Committee . . . . .	42
Funding and Mission Relationship in the Post-Proposition 13 Era . . . . .	44
Summary. . . . .	46
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY. . . . .	50
Selection of the Subjects . . . . .	50
The Instrument . . . . .	55
Development of the Instrument . . . . .	56
Mailing of the Instrument . . . . .	57
Statistical Treatment . . . . .	60
Summary. . . . .	63
IV. RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS . . . . .	64
Analysis of the Data: Question One. . . . .	64
Analysis of the Data: Question Two. . . . .	64
Analysis of the Data: Question Three. . . . .	70
Analysis of the Data: Hypothesis One. . . . .	72
Analysis of the Data: Hypothesis Two. . . . .	113
Analysis of the Data: Hypothesis Three. . . . .	124
Summary. . . . .	130
V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS . . . .	133

TABLE OF CONTENTS  
(continued)

	Page
Summary of the Study . . . . .	133
Summary of the Statistical Treatments. . . . .	135
Discussion . . . . .	136
Analysis of Questions One Through Three . . . . .	139
Analysis of Hypothesis One. . . . .	141
Analysis of Hypothesis Two. . . . .	153
Analysis of Hypothesis Three. . . . .	154
Conclusions. . . . .	154
Priorities Within the Mission . . . . .	155
Divergent Opinions Concerning Mission Functions . . . . .	158
Recommendations for Additional Study . . . . .	164
REFERENCES . . . . .	166
APPENDIX A: Survey and Board of Governors Statement . . . . .	173
APPENDIX B: Pilot Instrument. . . . .	177
APPENDIX C: Second Pilot Instrument . . . . .	179
APPENDIX D: Cover Letter First Mailing. . . . .	181
APPENDIX E: Cover Letter Second Mailing . . . . .	183
APPENDIX F: Board of Governors Statewide Mission. . . . .	185
APPENDIX G: Board of Governors Statewide Mission Working Draft, September, 1982. . . . .	190
APPENDIX H: Board of Governors Statement of Philosophy and Goals. . . . .	195

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number and Percentage of Returns . . . . .	54
2	Analysis of Pre and Post Rankings in Funding Free Condition by Pilot Study Group. . . . .	58
3	Analysis of Pre and Post Rankings in Funding Condition by Pilot Study Group . . . . .	59
4	Mean Responses by Three Funding Types. . . . .	66
5	Composite Priority Rankings. . . . .	67
6	Distribution of Function Statement Rankings for Funding Free Condition by Number of Responses and Percent. . . . .	68
7	Distribution of Function Statement Rankings for Student Interest Condition by Number of Responses and Percent. . . . .	69
8	Distribution of Function Statement Rankings for Funding Condition by Number of Responses and Percent. . . . .	71
9	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Associate Degree Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	74
10	Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test for Significant Differences Among Associate Degree Mean Ranks by Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Conditions . . . . .	75
11	Analysis of Variance of Associate Degree Priority Rankings in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	76
12	Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Associate Degree Mean Ranks in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups. . . . .	77

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

Table		Page
13	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Certificate Programs Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	78
14	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Community Services Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	79
15	Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test for Significant Differences Among Community Services Mean Ranks by Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Conditions . . . . .	80
16	Analysis of Variance of Community Services Priority Rankings in Funding Free Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	81
17	Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Community Services Mean Ranks for Funding Free Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	82
18	Analysis of Variance of Community Services Priority Rankings in Funding Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	83
19	Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Community Services Mean Ranks in Funding Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	84
20	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Continuing and Community Education Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	85
21	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of General Education Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	86

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

Table		Page
22	Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test for Significant Differences Among General Education Mean Ranks by Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Conditions . . . . .	87
23	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Joint Programs Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	88
24	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Remediation and Basic Skills Education Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	89
25	Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test for Significant Differences Among Remediation and Basic Skills Education Mean Ranks by Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Conditions . . . . .	90
26	Analysis of Variance of Remediation and Basic Skills Education Priority Rankings in Funding Free Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups. . . . .	91
27	Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Remediation and Basic Skills Education Mean Ranks for Funding Free Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	92
28	Analysis of Variance of Remediation and Basic Skills Education Priority Rankings in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	93
29	Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Remediation and Basic Skills Education Mean Ranks in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	94

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

Table	Page
30    Analysis of Variance of Remediation and Basic Skills Education Priority Rankings in Funding Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	95
31    Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Remediation and Basic Skills Education Mean Ranks in Funding Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	96
32    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Student Services Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	97
33    Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test for Significant Differences Among Student Services Mean Ranks by Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Conditions . . . . .	98
34    Analysis of Variance of Student Services Priority Rankings in Funding Free Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	99
35    Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Student Services Mean Ranks for Funding Free Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups. . . . .	100
36    Analysis of Variance of Student Services Priority Rankings in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	101
37    Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Student Services Mean Ranks in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups. . . . .	102
38    Analysis of Variance of Student Services Priority Rankings in Funding Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups. . . . .	103

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

Table	Page
39 Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Student Services Mean Ranks in Funding Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	104
40 Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Transfer Education Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	105
41 Analysis of Variance of Transfer Education priority Rankings in Funding Free Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	106
42 Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Transfer Education Mean Ranks for Funding Free Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups. . . . .	107
43 Analysis of Variance of Transfer Education Priority Rankings in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	108
44 Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Transfer Education Mean Ranks in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups. . . . .	109
45 Analysis of Variance of Transfer Education Priority Rankings in Funding Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups. . . . .	110
46 Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Transfer Education Mean Ranks in Funding Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	111
47 Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Associate Degree Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District. . . . .	114

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

Table	Page
48    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Certificate Program Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District. . . . .	114
49    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Community Service Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District. . . . .	115
50    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Continuing and Community Education Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District . . . . .	115
51    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of General Education Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District. . . . .	116
52    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Joint Programs Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District. . . . .	117
53    Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test for Significant Differences Among Joint Programs Mean Ranks by Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Conditions . . . . .	118
54    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Remediation and Basic Skills Education Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District . . . . .	118
55    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Student Services Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District. . . . .	120



LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

Table	Page
56    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Transfer Education Mission and Goals Statement According to Size of District. . . . .	120
57    Analysis of Variance of Joint Programs Priority Rankings in the Funding Condition According to Size of District. . . . .	121
58    Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Joint Programs Mean Ranks in Student Interest Condition by Three District Groups. . . . .	121
59    Analysis of Variance of Joint Programs Priority Rankings in the Funding Condition According to Size of District. . . . .	122
60    Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among Joint Programs Mean Ranks in Student Interest Condition by Three District Groups. . . . .	122
61    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Associate Degree Mission and Goals Statement by Community College . . . . .	125
62    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Certificate Program Mission and Goals Statement by Community College Attendance. . . . .	126
63    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Community Service Mission and Goals Statement by Community College Attendance. . . . .	126
64    Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Continuing and Community Education Mission and Goals Statement by Community College Attendance. . . . .	127

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

Table		Page
65	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of General Education Mission and Goals Statement by Community College Attendance. . . . .	127
66	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Joint Programs Mission and Goals Statement by Community College Attendance. . . . .	128
67	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Remediation and Basic Skills Education Mission and Goals Statement by Community College Attendance. . .	128
68	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Student Services Mission and Goals Statement by Community College Attendance. . . . .	129
69	Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Transfer Education Mission and Goals Statement by Community College Attendance. . . . .	129
70	Number of Significant Differences in Mean Ranks in Funding Free, Student Interest and Funding Conditions by Twelve Constituent Groups . . . . .	161

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Mean Priority Rankings of Mission and Goals Statements by All Respondents According to Three Funding Conditions: Funding Free, Student Interest and Funding . . . . .	65
2	Mean Priority Rankings of Mission and Goals Statements in Funding Free, Student Interest and Funding Conditions by All Respondents. . . . .	159

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The study of the mission and goals function statements of the California Community College System (CCC) is a major problem confronting educators, the established regulatory agencies, the Board of Governors, the Legislature, and also in a larger context, the students. The program function statements of the California Community Colleges have evolved over a period of approximately seventy-five years. The Board of Governors recently reestablished and reaffirmed nine specific function statements for the California Community Colleges (CCCBGMA, 1983). There is concern, however, about the process by which the Board of Governors addressed the study of these functions and their implied priority.

In 1981, the Legislature, alarmed at the large amount of State funding required to support the community colleges as an aftermath of the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, formulated a "hit list" of courses which were considered to be superfluous or contrary to the central mission of the California Community College system (CCC, 1982). There was considerable criticism from various constituent groups relative to the "hit list" courses and the elimination of specific funding. It appeared that the primary factor in the identification of these courses, was the opinion that they were primarily recreational and avocational. The report prepared by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office indicates that in

many cases the courses were selected only by title and not by content (CCC, 1982). In fact, at that time, approximately ten percent (10%) of the total Average Daily Attendance (ADA) generated in the entire community college system was in courses in these categories.

Regardless, the Legislature enacted the thirty million dollar cut and the Board of Governors was then charged with making corresponding alterations in courses. The process made significant impact on the offerings of cultural and artistic endeavor, and on courses which were of particular interest to that segment of the population that had long been underrepresented, i.e., women, minorities, handicapped, and older students. The action is well documented in the California Community College Report which indicates that the elimination of these courses resulted in certain imbalances in curricular offerings (CCC, 1982).

In 1984, however, the Board of Governors relaxed the criteria and indicated that local districts might now re-introduce the "hit list" courses into the curriculum, if in the opinion of the local Governing Board it was prudent to do so. However, no additional funding was offered for these courses (CCCBGMA, 1984a). This action gave credence to the argument that the principal intent of the course cut was simply to save money for the State and not to effect any permanent change in the community college curriculum offerings despite the original announced intent of the legislature.

In the Fall of 1982, the Board of Governors initiated a study of the function statements of the California Community College system.

The study was primarily conducted by the Board of Governors with some interaction with various constituent groups of the State. Testimony before the Board of Governors indicated that the Board should establish a wider constituent base and wider input into their study of the function statements of the California Community Colleges (CCCCBGMA, 1983).

Testimony was limited to a few constituent groups, a few interested individuals, and several spokespersons for campus organizations, principally administrators (CCCCBGMA, 1983). As a result of this reworking, the Board of Governors reaffirmed prior categorization of goals with some indication of priority among them (a) Associate Degrees, (b) Certificate Programs, (c) Community Services, (d) Continuing and Community Education, (e) General Education, (f) Joint Programs, (g) Remediation and Basic Skills Education, (h) Student Services, and (i) Transfer Education (CCCCBGMA, 1983). This narrow and limited process, however, left many critics and a large part of the constituency unsatisfied that the results had been achieved through a complete and impartial analysis.

The Executive branch of the State Government raised repeated questions as to the efficacy of community college education (CCCCBGMA, 1985a), (CCCCBGMA, 1985a). The Governor has indicated that the mission and goals functions, in fact, the placement of the California Community Colleges within the California Higher Education System, must be studied and resolved. There are some questions on the part of the Executive branch, as well as the Legislature, concerning growth of the community

college system. This growth has been unchecked except by certain funding limitations, and there is a widely held opinion that community colleges have strayed or departed from their original purpose and the intent of the California Master Plan.

The most recent version of the California Master Plan for Higher Education, in 1960, established that the community colleges would be charged with the responsibility of providing the transfer function for those students who wish to continue their educations to the state university, the University of California (UC), and state colleges and universities, the California State Universities (CSU). Recent comments and criticisms have focused on the transfer rate to the four-year colleges (Knoell, 1976), (CPEC, 1985), (CCC, 1984). The demographics of the state and the number of students wishing to attend institutions of higher education have changed markedly in the years since this plan was initiated. Because of this fact, there have been repeated calls in recent times for the reopening of the studies of the Master Plan Commission. Community Colleges have been loudly criticized for their failure to provide large numbers of transfer students, particularly minority transfer students, to the University of California and California State Universities. The opinion of most community college faculty and administration is that this criticism was and still is unwarranted, and was based upon faulty transfer statistics. However, that explanation did not lessen the criticism nor did it answer some of the questions that have arisen recently about program functions and values of the community colleges.

As a result of the aforementioned problems and criticisms, the Legislative body has formed the Commission to Review the Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of California (SB1570/Nielsen, 1985). This review of the Master Plan has been long awaited, and the outcomes should answer some of the outstanding questions regarding the specific roles of the three branches of public higher education in California. The Master Plan Commission has undertaken a series of hearings and is expected to continue its role in conjunction with the Joint Legislative Committee to Review the Master Plan for Higher Education in the near future.

The first phase of the Review of the Master Plan was the investigation of the California Community Colleges (SB2064/Stiern, 1985). The second and third phases will analyze the other two branches of the higher education system, and the interrelation between all three systems. The Joint Legislative Committee will review these reports, conduct additional study, and recommend proposed legislative changes. It was anticipated that these recommendations will clearly delineate the respective roles of the three segments of higher education, University of California, California State Universities and California Community Colleges, and consequently will result in a revised or renewed Master Plan.

More specifically, the Joint Legislative Committee was charged with the review of a number of issues:

The Legislation requires that:

SEC.2. The study described in this act shall be conducted as



follows:

(a) The study shall be an assessment of the mission of the community colleges. The assessment shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following: . . .

(2) An assessment of, and recommendations regarding, the appropriateness of all of the following programs, courses, and activities to the mission of the community colleges, particularly with respect to the functions of other state educational institutions, and the priorities which should be given to all of the following programs, courses, and activities:

- (A) Transfer programs.
  - (B) Vocational programs.
  - (C) Programs leading to associate degrees.
  - (D) Certificate programs leading to employment.
  - (E) General education courses.
  - (F) Remedial and basic skills courses.
  - (G) Noncredit courses.
  - (H) Fee-supported community services courses.
  - (I) Student services, including, but not limited to, counseling, testing, job placement, and financial aid.
  - (J) Other programs, courses, and activities currently offered by community colleges.
- (3) An assessment of the current socioeconomic composition of community college students, and recommendations for methods to ensure that all California residents will have access to community college programs and services. (SB2064/Stiern, 1985)

Concurrently, the California Round Table, an organization composed of the seventy-five largest employers in California, commissioned a study which analyzed the role of the California Community Colleges in higher education, course offerings, and a number of other related issues. In the Round Table report, Weiler et al. (1985a), indicated significant interest in public community colleges and reported several findings. The report did not, however, make specific recommendations. The Commission on State Government Organization and Economy has also conducted hearings, the intent of which was to study the California Community College system (CCSGOE, 1986).

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if the priorities of community college constituents are consistent with those previously cited function statements which were reestablished in the 1983 statement by the Board of Governors.

In this study, priority rankings of function statements were investigated through a systematic collection of data from twelve constituent groups within the California Community College system. The data was analyzed to determine the perceptions held by these groups in regard to what priorities should be ascribed to the function statements under their separate conditions. The conditions utilized were:

(1) Funding Free (when funding was not considered), (2) Student Interest (interest of students issues as main concern), and (3) Funding (level of funding considered first).

### Statement of the Problem

In the 1983 review of the programs, functions and purposes of the California Community College system, the Board of Governors reviewed a previous statement of missions and priorities and made some significant changes. The changes were criticized on various counts, perhaps the most significant one being a failure to systematically elicit opinions from the faculty, students, and various administrative groups. A review of the Board of Governor's meetings revealed that comments related to function statements were elicited almost entirely from top management. The present study addressed this problem by extending the groups involved in establishing priorities for community college

function statements. Further, the data collected was analyzed to provide a more detailed analysis of priority setting based on funding considerations and student interest. The study was designed to answer the following list of questions:

- 1) What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent groups when funding is not given consideration?
- 2) What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent group in regard to perceived student interest?
- 3) What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent groups when funding is given consideration?
- 4) Do the constituent groups rank function statements differently across the three conditions of funding free, student interest, and funding?
- 5) Are there differences in priority rankings across the three conditions of funding free, student interest, and funding as a result of a respondent's history of community college attendance?
- 6) Are there differences among priority rankings across the three conditions of funding free, student interest, and funding based on the size of the community college district?

A research questionnaire was developed in which the function statements taken from the Board of Governor's statement of 1983 were listed. The draft questionnaire was developed and validated by a panel of California Community College administrators. The final version was then distributed to the 106 community college districts in California with twelve responding groups as follows:

Board President (BP)

Chancellor (CH)

President and Superintendent (PS)

President (PR)

Academic Senate President (AS)

Student Body President (SB)

Chief Instructional Officer (DI)

Chief Student Services Officer (DS)

Chief Business Officer (BM)

Affirmative Action Officer (AA)

Director of EOPS (DE)

Public Information Officer (PI)

Respondents were asked to rank order the nine items identified in the Board of Governors mission statement in terms of priority. A follow-up mailing was conducted in order to obtain a good response and to increase the representation of the sample.

#### Questions and Hypotheses

The study questions addressed in the statement of the problem yielded three questions and three hypotheses.

Question One: What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent groups when funding is not given consideration?

Question Two: What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent group in regard to perceived student interest?

Question Three: What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent groups when funding is given consideration?

Hypothesis One: It is predicted that the twelve constituent groups will respond differently based on the condition (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding) under which they are ranking the function statements.

Hypothesis Two: It is predicted that there will be differences among the community college districts on the priority rankings assigned to each function statement when the three conditions (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding) are concurrently analyzed with the size of the district as the independent variable.

Hypothesis Three: It is predicted that there will be differences on the priority rankings assigned to each function statement between those individuals with a history of community college attendance vs. those who did not attend when the three conditions (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding) are concurrently analyzed with the college attendance as the independent variable.

#### Limitations

This study was limited to the perceptions of twelve responding groups within the California Community College system. It was further limited to responses to the established program function statements of the Board of Governors. There was no attempt, in the study, to gather perceptions based upon other criteria such as those recently advanced by California Community College Trustees (CCCT, 1986), the Commission for the Study of the Master Plan (Kerschner, 1986), or the Joint Legislative Committee (Murphy, B. & Lara, O., 1986b).

#### Assumptions

The following assumptions were made by the researcher:

- 1) That the responses to the questionnaires accurately reflected the individual's concept of function priorities.
- 2) That the priorities identified by the sample is representative of all California Community College personnel, and is, thus, generalizable to the California system.
- 3) That respondents were able to respond accurately to the function statement according to the condition under which they were asked to respond.
- 4) That even though the questionnaire to be completed was personally addressed to respondents named by position at each college, it was possible that questionnaires returned were those of individuals other than the individual to whom the instrument was sent.

#### Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

##### Associate Degrees (AD)

Community College districts will provide associate degrees in vocational-technical programs and liberal art programs (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-2).

##### Certificate Programs (CP)

Community College districts will provide certificate programs leading to early employment, and for continuing re-entry education (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-2).

##### Community Services (CS)

Community College districts may respond to unique local needs by

providing locally supported: avocational courses; recreational courses; community and cultural events; and community and civic center functions (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-4).

#### Constituent Groups

Constituent groups will refer to the twelve categories of employees, students, and trustees selected for participation in the study.

#### Continuing and Community Education (CCE)

Community College districts should provide non-credit classes which respond effectively to the following state and local needs pursuant to Education Code Section 84711 and in accordance with local delineation of function agreements: parenting, including parent cooperative preschools, classes in child growth and development and parent-child relationships, and classes in parenting; elementary and secondary basic skills and other courses and classes such as remedial academic courses or classes in reading, mathematics, and language arts; English as a second language; citizenship for immigrants; education programs for substantially handicapped persons; short-term vocational programs with high employment potential; education programs for older adults; educational programs in home economics; and health and safety education. This section should not be construed to apply to or interfere with any ongoing credit programs offered in the areas listed (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-3).

#### Funding (CF)

Funding shall mean that the amount or type of funding available

for each function is subject to current funding levels and policies established by the Board of Governors.

#### Funding Free (FF)

Funding free shall mean that the amount or type of funding available for each function statement should not be considered.

#### General Education (GE)

Community College districts will provide courses designed to contribute to associate degree programs and/or designed to broaden knowledge, skills and attitudes, to develop analytical ability and critical thinking and to foster interest in life-long learning in the educational, scientific and cultural fields essential for effective participation in a complex society (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-2).

#### Joint Programs (JP)

Community College districts are encouraged to participate in joint programs with business, industry, labor and government (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-4).

#### Master Plan

A differentiation of function for higher education for the University of California, California State University, and California Community Colleges. The plan provided for the development, expansion, curriculum and standards to meet the needs of the state. The plan addressed access, a policy of tuition free education, entitlement of each segment and selectivity in student admissions with specific quotas based upon academic ability. The plan provided access to higher education opportunities to anyone who could benefit from instruction



(Master Plan Survey Team, 1960).

### Proposition 13

A constitutional amendment to establish a limit on local property taxation and change the voting requirements for increases in other sources of government revenue (California Journal, June, 1978, p. 6).

### Remediation and Basic Skills Education (RBS)

Community College districts should provide remedial and basic skills education for students needing preparation for community college level courses and programs. Representative activities are: remedial courses for students with educational deficiencies; developmental courses and/or programs for students with special learning problems; and ongoing diagnostic/prescription programs providing for individual student skills needs (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-3).

### Student Interest (SI)

Student interest shall refer to the importance that individuals responding believe students exhibit in selecting areas of study in community colleges.

### Student Services (SS)

Community College districts will provide student services to meet identified needs of student development. Representative activities are: assistance in matters of admissions, financial aid, and job placement; diagnostic testing, evaluation and monitoring of student progress; academic, career, and personal counseling as related to the student's education; articulation with other collegiate institutions and with high schools; and student activities (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-2).

### Transfer Education (TE)

Community College districts will provide transfer programs which are carefully and continuously articulated with other collegiate institutions and the high schools (CCCBGMA, 1983, p. A-2).

### Significance of the Study

The program function statements of the California Community Colleges appeared to be a major problem confronting the Governor, Legislature, the Board of Governors, and 70 local districts. The wide range of diversity in programs, courses, classes, and students presently accommodated on over 106 community college campuses was a result of the growth of community colleges. Under the Master Plan, the community college had very specific roles and responsibilities. Goldberg (1985) and CCCT (1985) indicated that the Governor believed that colleges have departed from the prescribed functions and widened their responsibilities at the expense of the traditional transfer and vocational programs. There has been no comprehensive study to elicit responses from diverse groups within the system. Therefore, this study is significant in that it analyzed the perceptions of twelve selected respondent groups in the California Community College system who would be familiar with the individual campuses. This study, too, should provide information of value to California Community Colleges by identifying the perceptions of function statement priorities of these twelve constituent groups. In addition, the study could lead to a meaningful discussion of community college function statements.

Finally, different priorities for function statements may be

identified based upon any differences in perceptions for programs that are related to the demographic variables which have been identified.

#### Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. In Chapter I, a description of the purposes of the study, statement of the problem, limitations, definitions of terms, and significance were presented. Chapter II reviews the literature and presents a brief historical overview of the function statements of the California Community Colleges system and their evolution. Chapter III consists of the processes utilized to develop the research questionnaire, to validate the research questionnaire, to select sample population, and to collect and to treat the data. Data is analyzed and presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V consists of a summary, discussion of the statistical findings, study conclusion and recommendation for future study.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature is divided topically into three sections. First, a brief history of the California community college movement is presented in four periods of development and evaluation. The emphasis in this section will be on the historic development of the program offerings and functions, as well as all the curricular aspects of the community colleges. Documentation of the phenomenal growth rate is presented. Since the issue of funding has recently become a major focus in curriculum reform, it is presented where relevant.

The second section establishes the current context for reform by reviewing the post Proposition 13 era in five subsections dealing with both general and specific mission functions. After Proposition 13, the impetus for the most recent evaluation of the Master Plan of Higher Education gained momentum. The larger issue of reform of all three branches of higher education, California Community Colleges (CCC), California State Universities (CSU), and University of California (UC), in regards to funding, effectiveness, and measures of success provides the context for the debate about the mission and goals functions of the California community colleges.

The third section examines the funding and mission relationship. In the recent past the funding has neither been stable, nor consistent. The question of funding impact on the mission or priorities within the mission is discussed.

## History of The Community College in California, 1907 - 1978

In The Neglected Branch, California Community Colleges, Simpson (1984) observed the following: There is no definitive State policy for community colleges; State funding for community colleges has grown but in an erratic fashion; the student population has changed significantly; and transfer education and vocational preparation are still the goals of most students. The development of program offerings and functions, curricular aspects and brief review of selected historical development follows the four periods which Simpson identified.

The growth and evolution of California Community Colleges can be divided into four representative periods of development and refinement (Simpson, 1984, p.2):

1. 1900-1930 - Extension of Secondary Schools
2. 1930-1950 - Junior Colleges
3. 1950-1970 - Community Colleges
4. 1970 to the present - Community Learning Centers

### Extension of Secondary Schools (1900-1930)

During the first period, (1900-1930), college level work offered through high school districts was the general pattern of community college growth. Simpson (1984) wrote that the community college was a relatively recent addition to secondary and postsecondary education in California. The Legislature first authorized high school districts to offer college level course work in 1907. The Fresno Board of Education established the first two-year college program in 1910 with enrollment

of less than thirty individuals. By 1917, sixteen high schools in the State were providing college level courses in Mathematics, English, Modern Languages, History, Economics and Technical subjects. A special committee of the Legislature was appointed in 1919 to investigate concerns over the mission of two-year colleges. The committee recommended that the colleges provide courses of study in Civics, Liberal Arts, Science and Technology. Thirty-one public junior colleges were in existence in 1927. The majority were special departments under the jurisdiction of high school districts. Others were organized as separate districts or were operated by state colleges. Enrollment by 1928 had grown to approximately 25,000 students.

Simpson (1984) explained that junior college programs were funded by the State and were treated as a part of the general high school apportionment; however, in 1929, the decline in mining revenue prompted the Legislature to authorize the payment of up to \$30.00 per unit of junior college average daily attendance from the State General Fund. This thirty-year period of secondary school extension provided the first tentative steps of a new form of college education. Junior colleges evolved slowly, developing within the structure and resources of existing secondary and postsecondary institutions, unlike universities which began as separate institutions with a well defined role and clientele. Junior colleges prepared students for senior postsecondary institutions, offered some vocational training and provided some remedial education services.

### Junior Colleges (1930-1950)

The next twenty years of junior college evolution, (1930-1950), were marked by a large growth in the number of institutions and students and the development of an institutional identity separate from secondary schools (Simpson, 1984). The depression caused reductions in the level of State financial support. High unemployment rates, immigration, World War II and changing technical training needs contributed to the increase in enrollment. In 1937, 52,000 students attended forty-two colleges. The majority of these colleges operated as part of the high school districts. Many were separate districts, and only one remained as part of a state college.

By 1947, 45 junior colleges enrolled 107,000 students following a peak enrollment of 163,000 in 1942 (Simpson, 1984). In this period, junior colleges began to take over some of the vocational programs formerly taught by high schools and began to offer courses for adults. Student Counseling and Guidance Services began to emerge as a separate function and a more comprehensive curriculum was developed.

The Strayer Report of 1947, (Deutsch, M. E., Douglass, A. A. & Strayer, G. D., 1948) commissioned by the Legislature, made the first explicit statement about the open door policy of junior colleges. The report also stated that the objectives of the colleges were to provide: 1) Terminal (occupational) education; 2) General education; 3) College and career orientation and guidance; 4) Lower division transfer courses, 5) Adult education, and 6) Remedial education. The new policy stressed the importance of access for all students.

Students were offered a second chance through this system and junior colleges became the point of entry for many first generation families to obtain higher education (Simpson, 1984).

#### Community Colleges (1950-1970)

The third phase of community college development from 1950 to 1970 demonstrated increased enrollment and identification as a truly community college. Simpson (1984) maintained that two-year colleges during this period witnessed a six-fold increase in enrollment, realized a complete separation from secondary education, established an official place in higher education, and received official recognition as community colleges. The enrollment of 210,000 students in 1955 had grown to 340,000 in 1960 and 610,000 in 1967. Two-thirds of the population attended part-time. By 1960 more than one-half of the existing fifty-seven districts were organized independently of local high schools. In 1964, 56 of the 66 existing districts were organized separately from high schools. In some areas, adult education was offered by community college districts; in the majority of districts it remained a part of the high school program. The Donahoe Higher Education Act identified junior colleges as full partners in higher education in California and put forward the guidelines for the types of programs colleges were authorized to offer (Master Plan Survey Team, 1960). The reports, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California by the Master Plan Survey Team (1960), and A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education (Holy, T. C., McConnell, T. R. & Semans, H. H., 1955) indicated that public junior colleges should offer



instruction through but not beyond the 14th grade level. It was indicated that instruction may include but need not be limited to programs in standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions, vocational and technical fields leading to employment, and general liberal arts. The report, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, presented arguments that studies in these fields may lead to the Associate of Arts Degree. The separation of junior colleges state-wide from the public school (Kindergarten through twelfth grade) educational program was completed by the Stiern Act in 1967; the Stiern Act also provided for the creation of the Board of Governors (Simpson, 1984). The establishment of outreach programs designed to bring students, adults and ethnic minorities into the community college system and the finalization of student services and counseling also occurred during this period.

#### Community Learning Centers (1970 - 1984)

In the more recent period, (1970-1984), the community college has been characterized by continued steady rise in enrollment, acceptance of non-traditional courses and methods of program delivery and major instability in funding (Simpson, 1984). In 1981, 1.4 million students were enrolled. Twenty-one percent were full-time students; sixty-seven percent were part-time students enrolled in credit courses. Seventy districts included 106 colleges, sixteen off-campus centers and 2,700 smaller Outreach locations.

By 1975, (Simpson, 1984), one in ten adults were served by community colleges either by enrollment in credit courses, non-credit

courses, community service classes, or attendance at workshops, seminars, or contact with student support services. In contrast to the period 1947 to 1973 in which there was a single stable funding mechanism, Simpson described multiple community college funding arrangements during a ten-year period: 1) SB 6 (Alquist) in 1973, 2) the addition of an enrollment cap on ADA in 1975, 3) SB 154 (1978's "bailout" of Proposition 13), 4) block grant funding independent of ADA, 5) differential funding levels for noncredit ADA, 6) equalization of interdistrict revenue levels, 7) special funding for different types of districts, 8) the Budget Act of 1982 (which imposed a \$30 million dollar reduction), and 9) SB 851 (which imposed limitations on growth and decline of ADA).

The community college began in California in 1907 as an extension of the secondary school, the junior college, the community college and, finally, as the community learning center. Enrollment grew from fewer than thirty to more than 1.4 million students. There was a corresponding growth in the diversity of the curriculum and the needs of the students. The open door policies led to increased costs of operation and larger and larger fiscal demands on the taxpayers of the state. In the next section, the impact on the general and specific mission functions of the budget reductions following the passage of the tax cutting amendment to the State Constitution, Proposition 13, will be discussed.

#### The Post Proposition 13 Community College

The context for reform of the community colleges has been

addressed both in the general and specific arenas. The success of the system has been based on the open door and spirit of accommodation to the needs of a diverse population. It has been charged that the colleges have lost sight of their mission.

Patrick Callan, the former Chairperson of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, in recent remarks, has charged that the community college has not completed its agenda and that it is incumbent upon the colleges to sort out their missions. He argued that each of the institutions is a successful system, but colleges arrived at that point of success with little knowledge of how programs and activities relate to the missions and colleges have failed to understand the difference between mission and governance (Callan, 1985).

Callan's comments were similar to many that have been offered by critics of the community colleges, particularly in the period since the passage of Proposition 13 and the resultant implications for the funding of community colleges by the State, the intrusion of the State into the governance, and the supplanting of the local control of community colleges by locally elected trustees. This recent period of analysis of the growth and evolution of the California Community Colleges can be divided into three, not necessarily distinct and sequential, movements: 1) the search for community college mission in the post-Proposition 13 era; 2) the framework and recommendations of the Master Plan Study of California Community Colleges; and 3) the framework and recommendations of the Joint Legislative Commission Study of California Community Colleges. Within each of these divisions a

discussion of both the general mission and the specific mission and goals functions within the general mission is presented where relevant. Funding discussions will be addressed in an additional section.

The debate, discussion, argument by the Legislature, the Governor, the local trustees, administrators, students, faculty and the general public concerning the mission of the California community colleges and how they should be funded has led to the need for this study. How do the public and the individuals who attend and work in community colleges view the mission of the college and which of the mission functions should be funded and under what circumstances? Is there internal agreement on the mission and the priority within the mission functions? Do the internal priorities reflect what the public and oversight organizations are saying?

#### Mission in Post Proposition 13 Era

The community college as described in the earlier section experienced a steady rise in enrollment by opening its doors to all students. In trying to accommodate all applicants, the central mission as a vocational and transfer school was diluted by non-traditional courses for non-traditional students. The current debate about the community college mission has continued over approximately the last ten years and has reached a veritable crescendo with recent developments. In reporting the results of a survey which addressed community college mission, Rice (1986) indicated that the multimission nature of the California community college is a unique characteristic. In this study

she reported that most respondents are ambivalent about the desirability of this seeming lack of focus. The consensus of responses was that if the community college should try to be all things to all people, then it must redefine and refine its mission. In contrast, she reported that there was no agreement on what elements within that mission were to be maintained and strengthened or eliminated. The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC, 1981) in a report indicated that the California community college system gained its reputation as a full partner in higher education in 1960 by absorbing a major increase in lower division and transfer students. The excellence in vocational technical programs leading to certificates and degrees plus the extension of services to students not originally prepared for college was also considered a significant effort according to the report. Community colleges may be increasingly unable to do everything well by simply improving efficiency and productivity--choices and priorities must be made or the result will be that community colleges will do everything less well and some things unsatisfactorily (CPEC, 1981). In the same report, it was indicated that the public is still positive about the junior college image, but that the institutions must debate multiple functions and evolve the mission of the 1980's.

In Contours for Change (McIntyre, 1985), it was noted that the priorities among functions and the program balance within community college missions should be reviewed continuously as the educational needs of society change and institutional renewal takes place. Callan (1985) has indicated in The Question of Mission that the mission

should drive institutional operations, not the other way around.

College program offerings must take into account the institutional or state needs and the expansion of programs must take priority over the simple reduction of dollars.

#### Specific Mission and Goals Functions in the Post Proposition 13 Era

The examination of the general mission for community colleges must be accompanied by an examination of the specific mission functions of the program offerings. While there is agreement on the general mission, is there similar agreement concerning the explicit function? The Board of Governors established nine mission and goals functions. While there has been discussion concerning all nine, the literature suggested that Transfer Education, Certificate Programs, Student Services, and Remediation and Basic Skills had been most widely reviewed. A number of authorities have explored the mission and goal functions singly and in relation to each other. In this section their statements, comments and findings will be presented and then considered.

In the WICHE Report, Community Colleges at the Crossroads, Callan (1985) indicated that commitment to success and access now imposes greater expectations and responsibilities on students to meet higher standards, on institutions to provide quality education, and on the public to provide sufficient financial and political support to guarantee success. Callan indicated that community colleges are generally recognized as a vital component of public higher education. He noted that at the present time the 240 community colleges in the West enroll over 1.5 million students. Important challenges facing the

community colleges in the West focus on their continuing to provide access to higher education for an increasingly diverse student population, and while it is true that the number of students has increased, a complicating factor is the change in the composition of that student body (Callan, 1985).

Gilder (1981) in State Policy on Lifelong Education recommended a change in the state policies on mission, resource sharing, cooperative efforts and continuing education.

Weiler et al. (1985a), in A Study of California's Community Colleges, reported nine conclusions in the "Round Table Report": 1) transfer can be improved, 2) counseling and assessment programs are weak, 3) special assistance for minorities could be strengthened, 4) vocational programs are too job specific and not broad competency based, 5) there are no common standards for remedial programs, 6) faculty could be more effective, 7) finance incentives weaken program quality, 8) academic standards vary widely, and 9) intersegmental cooperation is weak. Weiler et al. further stated that with state leadership in establishing priorities and resolving other obstacles, significant improvements based upon the inherent strength and flexibility of the community college are possible.

Rice (1986) argued that the community colleges should continue the diversity of programs and courses and the flexibility in means used to achieve common goals in response to local needs. It was suggested that flexibility was best maintained by allowing local districts to make programming decisions. A majority of respondents (Rice, 1986) thought

that transfer should be primary; however, others indicated vocational education, community service and remedial instruction as primary functions. In The Neglected Branch (Simpson, 1984), colleges were urged to provide transfer vocational and general education courses.

Rice (1986) indicated that the community college should provide courses through the local community, and that the transfer function has to remain essential. She also noted that the public judges community college success by the proportion of transfer students who graduate, and the transfer function is necessary if the community college is to retain academic credibility. Rice proposed that without the transfer function, the image of "the last gasp" is reinforced, and high school students who can benefit from a community college education may be unwilling to enroll in what they see as a purely vocational or remedial institution.

Callan argued (CPEC, 1981) that the fundamental problem facing the community colleges was the ability to cope with ever increasing diversity of the students. During twenty years, programs and services had changed more slowly than the students. Callan noted that there appeared to be a reluctance to establish priorities among student clients, programs and services. Weiler et al. (1985b) lent additional support to clarifying the mission. In this study it was argued that almost all the substantial increase in community college enrollments over the last decade has been the result of part-time students. Community college students are older, on average, than lower division students at UC and CSU, although the full-time students are similar in



background and purpose to those of the last decade. In The Neglected Branch (Simpson, 1984), colleges were urged to provide student services.

According to Weiler et al. (1985b), there remained disagreement on the definition of college level work and the current definitions of what college-level work meant embraced a wide range of skill levels. They noted that University of California and California State Universities differed from community colleges in the definition of college-level work. This disparity was partially explained by the fact that high school graduation requirements were changed, particularly in the last twenty years; that there was a negative connotation of "remedial label", and that there were budget concerns at all levels regarding remediation (Weiler et al., 1985b). Smith suggested that community colleges should also provide remedial and basic skills classes (COCBGMA, 1985b).

John Roueche in Between a Rock and a Hard Place (1984) indicated that community colleges have come to bear the brunt of adult illiterates in American Higher Education. Community colleges have decades of experience in providing developmental and remedial courses. He noted that by the 1960's, the most offered courses in American community colleges were remedial reading, writing, and arithmetic. Central to the improvement of offering of remedial courses, Roueche cited eleven elements: 1) strong administrative support, 2) mandatory counseling and placement, 3) structured courses, 4) award of credit, 5) flexible completion strategies, 6) multiple learning system,

7) volunteer instructors, 8) use of peer tutors, 9) monitoring of student behaviors, 10) interfacing with subsequent courses, and 11) strong elements of program evaluation.

Weiler et al. (1985a) indicated that remedial enrollments are growing and suggested likely factors: 1) improved information about skill levels as assessment programs have expanded, 2) the ten-year decline in high school standards between 1970 and 1980, 3) the cap on growth in the K - 12 adult programs, 4) a larger proportion of underprepared students attending, and 5) growing number of returning adults.

In the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) Community Colleges at the Crossroads (Callan, 1985), open access for entry level courses was argued, but this access must be combined with the institution of prerequisites or demonstration of certain competencies. Callan noted that in this manner it will be necessary to provide appropriate remedial or compensatory courses.

While it is apparent that Transfer Education, Certificate Programs, Student Services and Remediation and Basic Skills Education are all areas of interest and discussion, there is no consensus on relative importance. In fact, Callan seems to imply that specific functions within the mission must await a redefinition of that mission. Rice, Weiler and others appear to be suggesting the opposite approach in which the general mission would be determined by first defining the specific functions. This issue of mission is also clearly tied to funding. What parts of the mission should be funded and how

should the priorities be established among remedial, transfer, vocational, continuing education and other areas?

#### The Master Plan Study of Mission

The debate about mission and funding during this Post Proposition 13 period is still unresolved. The Master Plan Study and Joint Legislative Committee continue to hold hearings and debate these questions. The focus of much of the recent literature has been one of rather prescriptive directions to the two study groups. It appears that much of the information provided to these groups is just a restatement of earlier positions that failed to gain acceptance by governing bodies.

In Chapter I, the Master Plan Study was discussed. Legislation created the California Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (SB 1570/Nielsen, 1985) and other legislation (SB2064/Stiern, 1985) required the Commission to reassess the community colleges as its first priority (Kerschner, 1986). The individuals on the Commission were appointed by the Governor (4), the Senate Rules Committee (3), the Speaker of the Assembly (3), the Regents of the University of California (1), the California State University Trustees (1), California Postsecondary Education Commission (1), Superintendent of Public Instruction (1), Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (1), and a staff of six. Kerschner reported that the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan held twenty-eight public hearings and open meetings and issued a report, The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges, after

considering statements delivered at the hearings, meetings, papers submitted and research by staff. He noted that a primary task addressed the mission of the colleges.

Smith (1986a), in A Call to Reform, argued that neither community colleges nor the people are well served by a community college mission statement that invites the college to be all things to all people. He noted that the explicit statement of mission must clarify the priorities within that established mission.

The community college mission since 1960 had been defined by the needs of different constituencies: communities, businesses, individuals and general societal changes as well as overall across the board pressure for remediation (Smith, 1986a). Due to all these pressures and expectations there had developed an imbalance of curriculum emphasis rather than a rational and ordered balance of academic, vocational, personal, remedial and transfer courses (Smith, 1986a). Smith claimed that stress on quality of courses has been lost in this maze of curriculum expansion.

In Contours for Change, McIntyre (1985) argued that the community college programs and services should reflect local variations consistent with the state interest. Diversity should affect program balance and emphasis. Simpson in The Neglected Branch (1984) indicated that the Master Plan established the structure and mission of community colleges as a partner in 1960. He noted, however, there was no priority and no emphasis on courses to be offered. The Neglected Branch indicated that in the 1970's combined steady rising enrollment

was for a large part due to acceptance of the nontraditional courses and methods of program delivery (Simpson, 1984).

Weiler et al. (1985b), in A Study of California's Community Colleges, indicated that three things have happened to change the public's perception of the colleges and introduce the issue of college missions into the current debate about the college's future. They were: 1) College priorities have changed, 2) Students have changed, and 3) Colleges have moved from local arenas to statewide scrutiny.

Smith (1986b) stated that an appreciation of the magnitude and character of college needs was reflected in the recommendations of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. Smith noted that the fundamental themes which are notable in the report were: 1) an affirmation of historic mission and role in the colleges; 2) an affirmation that access must be more firmly linked to success; 3) a search for greater accountability aimed at establishing clear lines of authority and delineating who should be responsible for what. Chancellor Joshua Smith further indicated that the Board of Governors should be pleased that the Commission made clear that the place of the community college is firmly and squarely in the realm of higher education; and that this placement will require broadening of the scope and responsibility of the Board. The language of the draft report (Kerschner, 1986, p.7) suggested the Commission made considerable effort to establish priorities among the several functions within the community college mission. Smith called for much more definitive delineation that will permit the colleges and the general public alike

to understand with confidence what our college system is about.

In further remarks, the Chancellor (Smith, 1986b) stated that a more definitive statement of priorities within the community college mission also must include a clear directive for community colleges to continue to respond with a sound educational program to those community and societal conditions thrust upon the colleges either out of necessity or to enhance economic development. Smith noted that the Board of Governors should assert that the statement of priority functions within the community college mission by the Joint Legislative Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education is basically consistent with the draft recommendations of the Commission but is less subject to interpretation and confusion.

Garcia (1986), in Seeking a Working Mission, advanced the faculty view. He indicated that the mission of the community colleges of the 80's required a new definition and public commitment to the principle of equality of results and not just equality of opportunity. In essence, he claimed the working vision must balance a commitment to academic excellence, individual differences, high standards, and equality--redefined. The goal must always be to define a realistic and pragmatic vision (Garcia, 1986).

Community colleges were viewed as truly democratic and that they are local, readily accessible and geared to meet a wide range of educational needs (Kerschner, 1986). The emphasis on various program elements, Kerschner claimed, changed over time to respond to the special needs of communities the colleges serve. That responsiveness

had produced diversity among community colleges according to Kerschner.

The Board of Governors advanced new conditions concerning associate degree level courses: 1) That five new criteria (critical thinking skills, college-level vocabulary and study skills, use of college-level reading material, ability to work independently and eligibility for degree-level courses in English and Mathematics) be advanced, 2) That the criteria for credit courses including the use of multiple measures of student performance, specified hours of homework, use of prerequisite skills and courses be expanded (Kerschner, 1986).

Kerschner (1986), in Background Papers The Challenge of Change, indicated that demands for adult education and English as a Second Language will increase between now and the year 2000. At the same time, he noted that access in language, literacy, and remediation will increase further only part of the concerns of the community college--the other part is to improve the probability of success by making learning more meaningful and demanding. Success required a cooperative effort and a wide variety of educational programs to serve a diverse population (Kerschner, 1986).

The open admission policy of the California community colleges, the rapid growth and soaring costs, their broadening of mission and functions to serve an increasingly diverse clientele, the shift from local to State funding--all came together to force the issues of access and success, mission and functions, funding accountability, and governance to the forefront of public and legislative interest (Kerschner, 1986).

The background papers of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education indicated the California Community Colleges have succeeded beyond all expectations (Kerschner, 1986). By broadening their mission and functions, California community colleges today serve a clientele that is, on the average, considerably older, more ethnic minority, lower income, less well-prepared academically, less fluent in English, and more job oriented than any other segment of postsecondary education. However, Kerschner stated the change in mission and in student clientele brought about a shift in emphasis--or at least in enrollments--from the transfer function toward the remedial, the adult education and the vocational functions.

In the Background Papers The Challenge of Change (Kerschner, 1986), it was argued that a shift is occurring from an emphasis on issues of access/equity to concern with issues of quality and budgetary constraints. It was noted that for many, access has been achieved and educational quality is now the goal; in a period of limited resources, decisions have to be made, and for many the option is for quality instead of access. Thus, many believed the issue before California is not increasing access to community colleges, but how to limit access and who will be limited (Kerschner, 1986).

Garcia (1986) pointed to the fact that California community colleges face the task of redefining their missions and their proper place in higher education. The problem of finding a realistic and pragmatic working vision mitigated the tensions between equality of opportunities in education and equality of results according to



Garcia's interpretation of the task. It appears that there is nearly unanimous support for the Master Plan Commission in the study of community college missions. The faculty, administration, and public are in agreement that the mission of the community colleges must be redefined. There is not obvious agreement on every aspect, but it appears that access has been largely achieved. The question of access has been overshadowed by the question of quality of education. The specific mission statements or functions must be of quality and provide valid educational experiences for the diverse population of the community colleges.

#### Specific Mission and Goals Functions in the Master Plan Study

As in the earlier periods the discussions concerning specific functions involved the nine Board of Governors' statements and several additional areas. The primary examinations concerned Transfer Education, Certificate Programs, Remediation and Basic Skills, Student Services and Community Services. In this section, establishment of priorities among the functions and the related movement to do so will be discussed.

Garcia (1986) argued that community colleges defined mission by redeeming and centralizing their primary dual objective of providing students with 1) the basis for obtaining college credits and subsequently transferring them, and 2) providing students with a combination of academic and technical vocational training. According to Garcia, community colleges also acknowledged an auxiliary derived mission to provide community members with lifelong learning activities

through credit and noncredit courses.

Kerschner (1986), too, argued that recommended priorities among the functions must be established; that while this may have some discouraging effect upon responsiveness to local community needs, it must be accomplished to avoid erosion in the transfer and vocational functions. However, he argued that the community colleges have attempted to be all things to all people. In the opinion of the Commission, this is clearly impossible and, therefore, some functions should supplement and not supplant the primary functions of transfer and vocational education.

Garcia (1986), concerned about the college identity as a transfer institution, argued that emphasis must be placed on academic transfers not remediation. Kerschner (1986), addressing the dual functions of California Community Colleges, stated that transfer and vocational education are primary functions and are worthwhile. Chancellor Smith (1986a) recommended the Board of Governors declare that the highest priority of the California community colleges is the provision of rigorous, high-quality degrees in certificate curricula and lower division arts and sciences and in vocational occupational fields. Smith (1986b) noted that these dimensions of curriculum are co-equal in every respect; transfer to baccalaureate degree programs, preparation for gainful employment, and attainment of Associate Degrees are the chief co-equal purposes for which the curricula are offered; and that all of these outcomes should be supported by both the academic and vocational dimensions. Weiler et al. (1985a) indicated that the

transfer function is impeded by four factors: 1) programs of special assistance to minority students are relatively weak, 2) counseling and assessment efforts remain undersupported, 3) course standards have often been lowered to maintain or increase enrollments, and 4) the process of articulation with four-year campuses is very often uneven.

Joshua Smith in Re-Thinking Board of Governors' Policies Concerning Remediation in Community Colleges (CCC, 1985b) indicated that community colleges should be regarded as the primary postsecondary providers of remedial education, but that students who failed to meet satisfactory progress should be dismissed. These students should enjoy a full range of services and that the articulation between community colleges and adult schools had to be strengthened (CCCBGMA, 1985b).

The issue of remediation was further exemplified by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education background papers (Kerschner, 1986), which indicated that California community colleges reflect the diversity of population in their communities: Some serve a large number of immigrants; others serve a large number of older adults and retired persons; still others a more traditional student clientele interested in transfer. The community college has maintained sufficient flexibility to serve all well (Kerschner, 1986). Smith (1986b) also stated that the provision of remedial instruction and support services are essential functions to make the policy of open access compatible with the primary function of delivering sound collegiate curricula, and that the provision of adult education curriculum of less than collegiate level in areas clearly defined as

being in the state's interest is an optional function which may be chosen in consort with the local public educational agencies under parameters and regulations to be established by the local agencies.

Smith (1986b) further stated the community service offerings which meet the unique local educational needs may be provided so long as they are fee supported and so long as their provision is compatible with the college's ability to place highest priority on their degree and certificate curriculum. In the background papers of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (Kerschner, 1986), the commitment to access was manifest in the creation of a wide variety of educational programs designed to attract and serve students from diverse backgrounds. The Commission noted that non-English speaking immigrants, ethnic minorities, those from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds, older working adults, and women seeking to enter the workforce, comprise a substantial proportion of the enrollment of many community colleges.

Garcia (1986) indicated that the dual mission of the California community colleges implies providing some remediation. He noted that remedial work should be complementary to the transfer function but not a substitute for it. Remediation below senior or junior level of high school is not and cannot become a primary function, Garcia claimed. The colleges have been charged with developing a better system of assessing students' needs and assisting their progress (Garcia, 1986). Kerschner (1986), too, stated that student services must be expanded; assessment, counseling and placement be acknowledged as a critical

first step in this expansion; that the community college be recognized as the principal point of entry; and that this point be recognized because of the last twenty years of the community college commitment to access. He did not recommend elimination of the support services, but maintained that they must be seen as supplementary.

The Chancellor (Smith, 1986b) stated that contract education is a form of Joint Programs and indicated that this function should be viewed as compatible with and ancillary to primary college functions. There appears to be agreement that Transfer Education and Certificate Programs are of highest priority. However, authorities also argue for comprehensive Student Services and Remediation and Basic Skills Education programs as integral to providing support for students.

#### The Joint Legislative Committee

The Joint Legislative Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education has conducted hearings and received the Report of the Commission. As recently as March 31, 1986, during discussions and deliberations regarding the background papers for the Master Plan Commission on Community College Reassessment Study, the consultants to the Joint Legislative Committee, Murphy and Lara, indicated:

The Commission's recommendation for reform along these lines and others are lodged in appreciation of the dramatic new context in which the college is outlined. While the Commission does not offer rich and detailed accounts of the major changes occurring in California's economy, culture and size, much of their reform package was received from the recognition that students served by the colleges are significantly different than those envisioned in the 1960 Master Plan. There are significantly more minority students, more women returning to education and to the work force, more workers seeking job skills in retraining, immigrants needing language training and other skills, adults of all kinds needing

broader forms of basic literacy. (Murphy, B. & Lara, O., 1986b, p.3)

Murphy and Lara (1986a), in background papers for the Joint Legislative Committee, affirmed the historic mission of the community colleges and stated that the community colleges can best serve the people of the state by priorities or other rankings explicitly designed to demonstrate priority for transfer and vocational programs.

In other remarks, Assemblyman Hayden, in Beyond the Master Plan (1986), proposed a value added approach to measuring whether institutions are actually improving student critical thinking, reading, writing and other learnable skills. He proposed that budgeting for performance, therefore, would pay an institution for the quality of education that is delivered. Hayden argued that "We have come to one of those crossroads where the world has changed again, and a new future has begun" (Hayden, 1986, p. 1). Inevitably, priorities in an educational institution are heavily influenced from the top as are the views of public governmental decision makers toward the state of education. Hayden further stated:

Today . . . the Master Plan is in need of re-examination. The competitive pressure of the new Pacific Rim era, the need for technological innovation and a more educated workforce, the challenge of educating vast numbers of underprepared minorities, and the need for a renewal of liberal education, all suggest the necessity of a new approach in higher education. The Master Plan needs revision to meet the challenges of this new era. The structure of higher education promotes a reputation of resource-based definition of excellence. . . . on the vast bottom are the community colleges which are supposed to transfer their lower division students to the four-year institution, as well as offering occupational, remedial and general education. (Hayden, 1986, p. i)

Callan (1985) argued that in the 1980's the community colleges must sort out their mission, for community colleges have not completed the agenda begun in the 60's. He noted that these institutions are successful systems, but knowledge of how programs and activities relate to missions is lacking. Callan stated that it is incumbent on the institutions to begin to understand the difference between mission and governance. The Joint Legislative Committee has been presented with the Master Plan Study Report and received comments in both written and testimonial form. Much of the information presented reiterated the material in the last section. The outcome of the committee report with recommendations to the legislature has been avidly awaited.

#### Funding and Mission Relationship in the Post-Proposition 13 Era

The debate concerning the mission and specific mission functions for community colleges cannot be separated from the issue of funding. As previously cited the funding formulas for community colleges have changed the funding base at least eight times in the last ten years. How do the public and those individuals attending, working or managing in community colleges view the mission? Should funding determine mission or priorities with the mission?

Community college finance has been unstable and inconsistent since the State rather than local revenues sources became the principal source. Critics have tied funding with the debate about a clear mission for California community colleges. Addressing the funding concerns, Weiler et al. (1985b) argued that the state support of the community colleges increased over the last decade, but this increase

did not offset the reduction in local revenue brought about by Proposition 13 coupled with its effect on inflation. At the same time, state support of the community college system had declined over the last ten years relative to public schools, California State Universities (CSU) and University of California (UC) (Weiler et al., 1985b).

In response to the short-term nature of legislative solutions, McCartan (1983) recommended a long range financing plan which would indicate no major changes in mission, goals or priorities. She proposed a marginal cost concept of community college support as a supplement to maintaining current support patterns similar to those in existence today with an overhaul in accountability.

Weiler et al. (1985b) tied funding to incomplete planning and indicated that the instability of the state financial decisions has made fiscal and program planning difficult. According to this study, the overall decline of state support had resulted in the elimination of many courses that the state no longer wanted to support, but had also caused other more far-reaching reductions in a serious lowering of course quality and reduction of services. While these courses which were primarily those in areas designated avocational and recreational have been eliminated in the community colleges, they remain integral components of the curriculum at UC and CSU. The courses included in this list were many art, physical education, and psychology courses. Examples of such are badminton, tennis, calligraphy and many behavioral psychology courses. (CCC,1982). And finally, Weiss (1982) argued that



colleges need to examine priorities and missions in light of serious pressures on resources rather than choosing which service areas to cut back. Weiss claimed that colleges should identify funding sources. He noted that colleges impress upon students the need for flexibility in career and life goals, so colleges themselves should be sufficiently flexible and adaptive in terms of goals, programs, clientele, and funding to meet the changing focus and shifts in society. There is agreement that the colleges need stable funding. It appears that there is also a consensus that colleges need to examine priorities and missions in light of pressures on resources.

#### Summary

California community colleges grew at varying rates in the period beginning in the early 1900's to the present. Authorized in 1907, the community college was a relatively recent addition to secondary and postsecondary education in California. In the early period the junior college programs were funded as part of the general high school apportionments and typically offered courses of study in civics, liberal arts, science and technology. Junior colleges evolved slowly developing from the instructional resources existing in postsecondary and secondary institutions, but by 1928, enrollment had grown to approximately 25,000 students. Junior colleges prepared students for senior postsecondary institutions, offered some vocational training, and provided some remedial education services.

Community colleges began to develop institutional identity separate from the postsecondary schools in the next twenty years of

their evolution. While the Depression caused a reduction in the level of financial support, other factors, including immigration, change of technical needs, and high employment rates, contributed to an increased enrollment. The majority of the colleges operated out of high school districts. The major program change during this time period was the assumption of vocational programs formerly taught by the high schools, the offering of courses for adults, and the separate function of curriculum was developed during this time period--in 1947 the student counseling and guidance services. A more comprehensive objectives of the college in the Strayer Report were terminal occupational education, general education, college and career orientation, guidance, lower division transfer courses, adult education and remedial education.

The third phase demonstrated increased enrollment and the identification as a community college. The astounding growth took place at the time when the colleges realized complete separation from secondary education, established an official place in higher education, and in 1960 the Donohue Higher Education Act identified junior colleges as full partners in the higher education system. The outreach program trying to bring students, adults, and ethnic minorities into the community college system was the major effort in this period.

The period from 1970 to the present is another period of large growth in enrollment. At the same time, it represents the acceptance of non-traditional courses in its program delivery, but, for the first time, reflects major instability in funding. Community colleges accommodate a larger and broader percentage of the student population.

The major change that occurred in 1978 was the assumption by the State for major responsibility for the funding of the community colleges. In this period, the intrusion of the State into local governance and the supplanting of local control of community colleges normally exercised by the Board of Trustees served to focus public attention on community colleges with the scrutiny of such agencies as the State Legislature and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. The inherent differences among the locally developed community colleges focused both internal and external criticism upon the community colleges. The large expenditure for community colleges caused the Legislature to examine curricular offerings at the various community colleges. In periods of unlimited growth, the community colleges have tried to be all things to all people. The diversity of the community college student population has led to questions about the quality of education as the diversity of the students in the classrooms has tested the ability of the institution to respond. This growth and diversity of students has led to the charge that community colleges have expanded their mission. The major elements of the mission were to open access in a comprehensive curriculum including academic and vocational community education. The program elements of the first colleges have remained fairly consistent. Numerous authorities have cited unresolved differences and opinions concerning the mission and functions and priorities for community college education. In times of budget constraint, the mission of community colleges has been defined by exclusion rather than a clear statement of state-wide interests and

priorities.

The debate concerning the mission of the community colleges and how they should be funded led to the need for this study. How do individuals who attend, work in and manage the colleges view the mission and goals functions? Which of these functions should be funded under changing circumstances? Do these individuals agree internally with the mission functions and do they reflect what the public is saying?

This chapter contains a review of the literature with emphasis on the history of the community college in California; the current context for reform including the post Proposition 13 era; the Master Plan of Higher Education and the activities of the Joint Legislative Committee; and the funding and mission relationship. Chapter III presents the design and methodology of the study.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the priorities assumed within the function statements of the California Community College Board of Governors. The priorities were determined by surveying twelve constituent groups within each community college in the state of California. The respondents were asked to rank order the function statements based on the perceived influence when the primary factors considered were impact of funding, a funding free condition, and student interest. In addition, the respondent's personal educational experience in the community college system was requested as a potential variable. The following steps were taken to accomplish this study: 1) identification of the twelve constituent groups to be surveyed, 2) design and piloting of the survey instrument, 3) initial and follow-up mailing of the instrument, and 4) analysis of the data.

#### Selection of the Subjects

The California Community College system is divided into seventy districts. Each district has a locally elected board of trustees and contains one or more colleges. At the present time, there are 106 recognized community colleges. Since the demographic variables that were of interest in this study varied widely both among and within districts, it was decided that the most representative method of sampling would be to send surveys to all 106 community colleges. The potential of receiving responses from all colleges seemed of greater

value in terms of generalizability of the major findings of this study.

Within each college, twelve groups were identified as "constituent" members for the purpose of this study. The twelve groups included: 1) presidents of the boards of trustees, 2) superintendents or chancellors, 3) superintendent-presidents, 4) presidents, 5) chief instructional officers 6) chief student services officers, 7) chief business officers, 8) presidents of the academic senate, 9) presidents of the student body, 10) public information officers, 11) affirmative action officers, and 12) directors of economic opportunity programs and services. The groups were identified, in a general sense, based on their official roles as college personnel and the groups they represent as a function of that role.

The Presidents of the Boards of Trustees were chosen as subjects since the Board's primary role is to establish policies and procedures which govern the district in which they are elected. Since they are elected by the community, they, to some degree, may also reflect a public oriented view of the college.

The three categories which represent the role of chief executive officers at a college are: Superintendents or Chancellors, Superintendent-Presidents, and Presidents. Superintendents or Chancellors are from multi-campus districts, while Superintendent-Presidents are from single campus districts. Presidents are found in multi-campus districts and are the chief executive officers for each college within that district. These positions collectively represent an individual who is responsible for

implementing board policies and procedures as well as being recognized as the chief executive officer. These three positions were treated as distinct groups because each represents colleges that have different governance as well as distinct demographic variables.

Chief Instructional Officers and Chief Student Services Officers were chosen because these positions exist at all colleges and represent the individuals that have the most direct contact and responsibility for the student population. They are treated as separate categories because the focus of the Chief Instructional Officer is curriculum development, evaluation, and organization while the student service position is concerned with student recruitment, admission, and enrollment. Thus each has a different focus within the college.

The Chief Business Officers were chosen because of their responsibility for monitoring funding issues, budget development and interpretation of funding criteria. Further, this group had not been actively sought out for input in relation to mission and goals in the past.

In order to have representative input from faculty and student groups, the Presidents of the Academic Senate and Presidents of the Student Body were asked to respond. In the past, these groups have had some minimal input in the mission and goals process. The President of the State Academic Senate was formally involved, while the Student Body Presidents appeared to have no formally recognized voice.

Public Information Officers are the official spokespersons for the college, and are responsible for representing the institution via print

and nonprint media to the public. When this responsibility was considered, it was questioned what impact their perceptions may have on their job should they differ considerably from other groups.

Affirmative Action Officers' major role is to monitor affirmative action programs for staff and students. They are involved in faculty and staff recruitment and selection, as well as, student initiated issues related to affirmative action concerns. They were chosen because of their close and consistent contact with groups that traditionally have been under-represented, e.g. women, ethnic minorities, Viet Nam era veterans, handicapped and the aged.

Directors of Educational Opportunity Programs and Services are responsible for administering all special services related to and provided for economically disadvantaged students. In addition to an economical disadvantage, many of the individuals are "protected" group members. Members of this group were chosen because the special population served and the fact that this population has been vocal about their lack of representation in the mission and goals development process.

The initial mailing of the survey instrument to the twelve constituent groups was during the month of May, 1985. A follow-up mailing to non-respondents was done during the last two weeks of August, 1985. A total of 623 instruments, or 61.26% were returned, 620 were used for analysis of responses. To be considered valid, the respondent had to complete rankings for at least one of the categories on the survey. Table 1 is a display of the total number of individuals



Table 1



--

--



representing each constituent group (population), the number, and percent of the individuals responding to each mailing. The final column represents the size and proportion of the final sample utilized in the statistical analysis. This table summarizes the percent of respondents for each category and total sample.

#### The Instrument

The instrument utilized in this study was designed by the researcher. A copy of the instrument and explanatory information that was sent to each subject are in Appendix A. The instrument was designed to elicit the rank ordering of function statements based on the impact of three different conditions. Thus, the respondent actually completed three separate rankings of the mission and goals with each one of the three dependent on the condition considered as the dominant factor in determining the ranking assigned to each mission and goals statement. The three conditions considered were 1) a funding free condition, 2) student interest, and 3) impact of funding. Within each conditional category, the function statements were listed alphabetically in order to avoid the implication of a pre-determined priority. The complete text of the function statements which includes an explanation of each, was also reorganized alphabetically so that it would match the instrument. The respondent's personal educational experience in the community college system was requested as a potential variable. The results of the rank orders provided the basis for determining the priorities the selected constituent groups ascribed to the mission and goals for the California Community College System. In

addition, analysis among the constituent groups based on the demographic variable of size of the District was possible.

#### Development of the Instrument

The instrument in this study was developed in two stages. The first stage was the design of a pilot instrument (Appendix B) administered to a group of experienced administrators at San Joaquin Delta Community College which is similar in composition to those that would participate in the study. The participants in the pilot study received a copy of the complete text of the function statements to assist them in the completion of the survey instrument. In addition, comments regarding the content validity and design of the instrument were elicited in writing and through discussion. The participants in the pilot group generally agreed that the content of the instrument was valid and the ranking was an appropriate response mode. Responses to the design of the questionnaire resulted in the following change: The two funding conditions were separated by the student interest condition in order to emphasize the different intent of the two funding based categories. Other substantive suggestions related to the information needed to clarify the intent of the instrument and how it was to be completed. These suggestions were incorporated in a cover letter and sent with the second pilot survey instrument (Appendix C). The instrument was redesigned with the funding categories separated and with the addition of the fourth column which requested the type of personal experience or involvement the respondent had with a community college as a student. The latter addition was based solely on the

interest of the researcher as an exploratory effort to determine if being a former student of the system would effect the individual's perception of the priorities of mission and goals. Whether this question could be answered was, of course, dependent on the number of respondents who had been former students.

With the aforementioned changes complete, the researcher readministered the survey. A t-test was performed on the pre and post survey responses for Funding and Funding Free Categories to determine reliability of the instrument. The resulting coefficients (Tables 2 and 3) indicated that there were no significant differences between each ranking assigned on the first and second administrations for all items under consideration except number eight, Student Services. Apparently, the respondents slightly changed their priority rankings for this category between the first and second administrations. Thus one must have some concern about the stability of individual perceptions of the priority which is ascribed to Student Services over a period of time. Thus the reliability of the instrument was established as representing stable and consistent rankings with only slight concern indicated for the stability of individual opinions over Student Services. No further suggestions from the pilot group regarding changes were received.

#### Mailing of the Instrument

Each instrument was mailed with a copy of the function statements and a cover letter (Appendix D) explaining the purpose of the study and the procedure for returning the survey. Each envelope contained a

Table 2  
T-Test Analysis of Pre and Post Rankings  
in Funding Free Condition  
by Pilot Study Group  
n = 13

Variable	D.F.	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value
Associate Degrees	12	3.1538 2.8462	2.035 1.625	0.60
Certificate Programs	12	2.8462 2.8462	1.144 1.519	0.00
Community Services	12	7.6923 7.5385	1.932 2.025	0.30
Continuing and Community Education	12	6.4615 5.1538	1.561 1.625	3.87
General Education	12	3.8462 3.5385	1.676 1.984	0.63
Joint Programs	12	7.4615 7.3077	1.941 1.182	0.38
Remediation and Basic Skills Education	12	5.7692 6.4615	1.423 1.613	-1.81
Student Services	12	5.7692 7.0769	2.242 2.060	-2.39*
Transfer Education	12	2.0000 2.2308	1.354 0.832	-0.51

\*p<.05

Table 3  
T-Test Analysis of Pre and Post Rankings  
in Funding Condition  
by Pilot Study Group  
n = 13

Variable	D.F.	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value
Associate Degrees	12	3.3077 3.4615	1.888 1.450	-0.34
Certificate Programs	12	2.6923 2.6154	1.251 1.387	0.17
Community Services	12	7.7692 7.5385	1.787 2.184	0.48
Continuing and Community Education	12	6.3077 5.3846	1.377 1.609	1.80
General Education	12	4.1538 3.8462	1.625 1.519	1.00
Joint Programs	12	7.1538 7.6923	2.304 1.032	-0.89
Remediation and Basic Skills Education	12	5.8462 6.0000	1.994 1.780	-0.27
Student Services	12	5.6923 6.6923	2.496 2.463	-2.36*
Transfer Education	12	2.0769 1.7692	1.115 0.599	0.84

\*p<.05

stamped, self-addressed envelope for return. A total of 1,017 questionnaires were mailed during May, 1985. Since the mailing occurred late in the school year, the researcher was prepared to do another follow-up mailing at the beginning of the 1985-86 school year. The first mailing resulted in the receipt of 457 responses. When a survey was returned, it was coded with identification numbers, checked for completeness and then the responses were coded for computer entry. The same procedure was followed with the 166 returns from the second mailing (Appendix E). By October, 1985, surveys had ceased coming in the mail with a final return response total of 623 from the 1,017 mailed for a 61.26 percent return.

#### Statistical Treatment

The surveys were coded for entry into the computer. All data analyses were done on the VAX computer at University of the Pacific using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Version X (SPSSX, 1986). The accuracy of the data entry was verified via double entry followed by a computer generated verification. The program, "Frequencies" in (SPSSX, 1986) was utilized to get descriptive statistics on all data, as well as to provide an additional check of the accuracy of the data entry, and to analyze Questions One through Three.

Question One: What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent groups when funding is not given consideration?

Question Two: What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent group in regard to perceived student interest?

Question Three: What is the ranking of the nine functions by the constituent groups when funding is given consideration?

Hypothesis One: It is predicted that the twelve constituent groups will respond differently based on the condition (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding) under which they are ranking the function statements.

Hypothesis Two: It is predicted that there will be differences among the community college districts on the priority rankings assigned to each function statement when the three conditions (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding) are concurrently analyzed with the size of the district as the independent variable.

Hypothesis Three: It is predicted that there will be differences on the priority rankings assigned to each function statement between those individuals with a history of community college attendance vs. those who did not attend when the three conditions (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding) are concurrently analyzed with the college attendance as the independent variable.

Repeated measures analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was utilized to test Hypotheses One through Three. All of these hypotheses were posited to determine the differences in assigned mean rankings for each of the function statements by each constituent group, the size of the college, or community college experience. The MANOVA was performed for each of the nine rankings under the three conditions. The MANOVA procedure provided an analysis which enabled the researcher to make comparisons at two levels. The first level was among the three conditions (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding), the second was



among the function statements. For each hypothesis, the nature of the responding group was altered in order to examine variations in priority according to individual position, college size, and history of attendance. Thus comparisons across the three conditions enabled the researcher to determine the relative influence of a particular condition on mean priority rankings. This was possible because the MANOVA procedure simultaneously compares the mean rankings within each condition during the process of the analysis. A Fisher's Least Significance Difference Test was calculated for each MANOVA which produced results indicating a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) across the three conditions (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding). The mean rankings which differed significantly ( $p < .05$ ) across the three conditions based on the MANOVA results were then analyzed in a one-way ANOVA. This ANOVA was used to pinpoint differences among mean priority rankings within a single condition. Oneway ANOVAs were used to examine the specific differences among the groups, the size of the college district, or community college experience on each priority under the condition specified. A Duncan Multiple Range Test was done to determine which means were significantly different. The minimum confidence level established for the aftertests was  $p < .05$ . Tests at the .05 and .01 level were performed. The means that were identified at the highest confidence level were accepted as stable and utilized in the discussion of the results. This was done since the chance of committing a type one statistical error is greater when the lower confidence level is chosen.

### Summary

The purpose of this study was to gather data regarding constituent groups perceptions about mission and goals function statements for their respective California community colleges under three conditions: full funding, student interest and conditional funding. The description of research methodology included procedures for the selection of subject, development of the instrument, mailing of the instrument, and the statistical treatment of the data were included in this chapter. Chapter IV presents the analysis of the data.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter contains the results of the analyses related to the questions and hypotheses posed in the study. The data related to the first three research questions are discussed first. Each hypothesis is then presented with the results of the analyses used to examine it.

#### Analysis of the Data: Question One

Question One asked what would be the rankings of the nine mission and goals statements by the twelve constituent groups in the funding free condition? In order to answer this question, the subprogram, "Frequencies" (SPSSX, 1986) was used to tabulate and sort the responses. The results are presented in Figure 1 and Tables 4, 5, and 6. In the Funding Free condition, it appears that the three function statements receiving the highest priority ranking, when the actual ranks are considered, are Associate Degrees, Transfer Education, and General Education. However, when the mean ranks are examined, the three function statements receiving the highest priority ranking are Associate Degrees, Transfer Education, and Certificate Programs. The two function statements receiving the lowest priority ranking were Community Services and Joint Programs.

#### Analysis of the Data: Question Two

Question Two asked what would be the rankings of statements by the twelve constituent groups in the student interest condition? In order to answer this question, the subprogram, "Frequencies" (SPSSX, 1986)

Table 4  
Mean Responses by Three Funding Types

Functions	Funding Free		Student Interest		Funding	
	← Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Associate Degrees	2.78	1	3.29	3	3.10	2
Certificate Programs	3.35	3	3.18	2	3.40	2
Community Services	7.81	9	7.55	8	7.96	9
Continuing and Community Education	6.17	7	5.80	7	6.28	7
General Education	3.53	4	3.96	4	3.83	4
Joint Programs	7.53	8	7.75	9	7.49	8
Remediation and Basic Skills Education	5.26	5	4.68	5	4.64	5
Student Services	5.51	6	5.66	6	5.17	6
Transfer Education	3.04	2	3.11	1	3.07	1

was used to tabulate and sort the responses. The results are presented in Figure 1 and Tables 4, 5, and 7. In the Student Interest condition, it appears that the three function statements receiving the highest priority ranking, when the actual ranks are considered, are Transfer Education, Associate Degrees, and General Education. However, when the mean ranks are examined the three function statements receiving the highest priority ranking are Transfer Education, Certificate Programs,

Table 5

## Composite Priority Rankings

Composite Priority Rankings	Funding Free	Student Interest	(Conditional) Funding
1	Associate Degrees	Transfer Education	Transfer Education
2	Transfer Education	Certificate Programs	Associate Degrees
3	Certificate Programs	Associate Degrees	Certificate Programs
4	General Education	General Education	General Education
5	Remediation and Basic Skills Education	Remediation and Basic Skills Education	Remediation and Basic Skills Education
6	Student Services	Student Services	Student Services
7	Continuing and Community Education	Continuing and Community Education	Continuing and Community Education
8	Joint Programs	Community Services	Joint Programs
9	Community Services	Joint Programs	Community Services

Table 6

## Function Statement Rankings for Funding Free Condition by Number and Percentage of Responses

n = 620

Function Statement	1	2	3	4	Rank 5	6	7	8	9
Associate Degrees	228 (36.8)	134 (21.7)	92 (14.9)	52 ( 8.4)	31 ( 5.0)	36 ( 5.8)	17 ( 2.7)	12 ( 1.9)	17 ( 2.7)
Certificate Programs	40 ( 6.5)	169 (27.3)	176 (28.4)	107 (17.3)	66 (10.7)	33 ( 5.3)	14 ( 2.3)	10 ( 1.6)	4 ( 0.6)
Community Services	3 ( 0.5)	5 ( 0.8)	6 ( 1.0)	13 ( 2.1)	20 ( 3.2)	32 ( 5.2)	107 (17.3)	184 (29.7)	249 (40.2)
Continuing and Community Education	22 ( 3.5)	15 ( 2.4)	30 ( 4.8)	49 ( 7.9)	79 (12.7)	100 (16.1)	141 (22.7)	149 (24.1)	34 ( 5.5)
General Education	139 (22.4)	84 (13.5)	82 (13.3)	130 (21.0)	71 (11.5)	59 ( 9.6)	31 ( 5.0)	16 ( 2.6)	7 ( 1.1)
Joint Programs	1 ( 0.2)	2 ( 0.3)	13 ( 2.1)	19 ( 3.1)	35 ( 5.7)	63 (10.2)	127 (20.5)	132 (21.3)	227 (36.6)
Remediation and Basic Skills Education	17 ( 2.7)	32 ( 5.2)	64 (10.3)	99 (16.0)	135 (21.8)	116 (18.7)	73 (11.8)	43 ( 6.9)	40 ( 6.5)
Student Services	18 ( 2.9)	27 ( 4.4)	42 ( 6.8)	79 (12.7)	132 (21.3)	141 (22.7)	84 (13.5)	60 ( 9.7)	36 ( 5.8)
Transfer Education	149 (24.0)	154 (24.8)	113 (18.3)	72 (11.6)	52 ( 8.4)	40 ( 6.5)	21 ( 3.4)	12 ( 1.9)	6 ( 1.0)

Table 7

Function Statement Rankings for Student Interest Condition by Number and Percentage of Responses

n = 620

Function Statement	1	2	3	4	Rank 5	6	7	8	9
Associate Degrees	153 (24.7)	110 (17.7)	116 (18.7)	67 (10.8)	58 ( 9.4)	48 ( 7.7)	33 ( 5.3)	19 ( 3.1)	7 ( 1.1)
Certificate Programs	89 (14.4)	179 (28.9)	117 (18.9)	104 (16.6)	46 ( 7.4)	47 ( 7.6)	19 ( 3.1)	6 ( 1.0)	4 ( 0.6)
Community Services	3 ( 0.5)	10 ( 1.6)	7 ( 1.1)	18 ( 2.9)	28 ( 4.5)	44 ( 7.1)	111 (17.4)	191 (30.8)	199 (31.9)
Continuing and Community Education	40 ( 6.5)	22 ( 3.5)	53 ( 8.5)	57 ( 9.2)	59 ( 9.5)	75 (12.1)	140 (22.6)	140 (22.6)	25 ( 4.0)
General Education	105 (16.9)	71 (11.5)	79 (12.8)	113 (18.2)	92 (14.8)	72 (11.6)	45 ( 7.3)	26 ( 4.2)	8 ( 1.3)
Joint Programs	5 ( 0.8)	1 ( 0.2)	6 ( 1.0)	14 ( 2.3)	33 ( 5.3)	47 ( 7.6)	106 (17.1)	123 (19.8)	276 (44.5)
Remediation and Basic Skills Education	27 ( 4.4)	54 ( 8.7)	90 (14.5)	98 (15.8)	134 (21.6)	125 (20.2)	44 ( 7.1)	18 ( 2.9)	21 ( 3.4)
Student Services	18 ( 2.9)	31 ( 5.0)	43 ( 6.4)	83 (13.4)	101 (16.3)	121 (19.6)	83 (13.4)	71 (11.5)	60 ( 9.7)
Transfer Education	171 (27.6)	130 (21.0)	98 (15.8)	65 (10.5)	57 ( 9.2)	33 ( 5.3)	30 ( 4.8)	15 ( 2.4)	12 ( 1.9)

and Associate Degrees. The two function statements receiving lowest priority ranking were Joint Programs and Community Services.

#### Analysis of the Data: Question Three

Question Three asked what would be the rankings of the nine function statements by the twelve constituent groups in the funding condition? In order to answer this question, the subprogram, "Frequencies" (SPSSX, 1986) was used to tabulate and sort the responses. The results are presented in Figure 1 and Tables 4, 5, and 8. In the Funding condition, it appears that the three function statements receiving the highest priority ranking, when the actual ranks are considered, are Associate Degrees, Transfer Education, and General Education. However, when the mean ranks are examined, the three function statements receiving the highest priority ranking are Transfer Education, Associate Degrees, and Certificate Programs. The two function statements receiving lowest priority ranking were Community Services and Joint Programs.



Table 8

Function Statement Rankings for Funding Condition by Number and Percentage of Responses

n = 620

Function Statement	1	2	3	4	Rank 5	6	7	8	9
Associate Degrees	194 (31.3)	109 (17.6)	86 (13.9)	67 (10.8)	54 ( 8.7)	33 ( 5.3)	26 ( 4.2)	19 ( 3.1)	14 ( 2.3)
Certificate Programs	57 ( 9.2)	153 (24.7)	136 (21.9)	114 (18.4)	72 (11.6)	43 ( 6.9)	14 ( 2.3)	10 ( 1.6)	3 ( 0.5)
Community Services	3 ( 0.5)	5 ( 0.8)	4 ( 0.6)	10 ( 1.6)	7 ( 1.1)	42 ( 6.8)	83 (13.4)	175 (28.2)	273 (44.0)
Continuing and Community Education	13 ( 2.1)	21 ( 3.4)	24 ( 3.9)	42 ( 6.8)	71 (11.5)	98 (15.8)	146 (23.5)	189 (25.6)	28 ( 4.5)
General Education	121 (19.5)	75 (12.1)	72 (11.5)	99 (16.0)	85 (13.7)	77 (12.4)	55 ( 8.9)	13 ( 2.1)	5 ( 0.8)
Joint Programs	2 ( 0.3)	6 ( 1.0)	14 ( 2.3)	15 ( 2.4)	37 ( 6.0)	61 ( 9.8)	112 (18.1)	140 (22.6)	215 (34.7)
Remediation and Basic Skills Education	40 ( 6.5)	54 ( 8.7)	83 (13.4)	94 (15.2)	132 (21.3)	97 (15.6)	58 ( 9.4)	22 ( 3.5)	22 ( 3.5)
Student Services	33 ( 5.3)	48 ( 7.7)	59 ( 9.5)	82 (13.2)	90 (14.5)	117 (18.9)	87 (14.1)	53 ( 8.5)	33 ( 5.3)
Transfer Education	140 (22.6)	136 (21.9)	123 (19.9)	82 (13.2)	53 ( 8.5)	30 ( 4.8)	20 ( 3.2)	9 ( 1.5)	9 ( 1.5)

### Analysis of the Data: Hypothesis One

Hypothesis One: It is predicted that the twelve constituent groups will respond differently based on the condition (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding) under which they are ranking the function statements.

Hypothesis One stated that the twelve constituent groups would respond differently based on the condition (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding) under which they were ranking the function statements. In order to test this hypothesis, the subprogram MANOVA (SPSSX, 1986) was used to analyze the mean differences for each function statement across the twelve groups with the three conditions as the repeated measures. The repeated measures design allowed the researcher to determine how the twelve constituent groups differed in their responses to the mission and goal function statements under each of the three conditions when group membership was the independent variable. The results of the MANOVA analyses are reported in Tables 9, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23, 24, 32 and 40. Following each MANOVA which produced results indicating a significant difference among the three conditions (Funding Free, Student Interest, Funding), when the confidence level for the F ration was  $p < .05$  or better, is a Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test. Oneway ANOVAS were used to examine the specific differences among the groups on each priority under the condition specified. A Duncan Multiple Range Test is reported for each ANOVA when the confidence level for the F ratio was  $p < .05$  or better.

The results of the MANOVAS indicated that there were significant differences in the respondents' rankings when compared across the three

conditions for function statements: Associate Degrees, Community Services, General Education, Remediation and Basic Skills Education, Student Services, Transfer Education. A Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test was calculated and the results revealed significant differences between means for function statements: Associate Degrees, Community Services, General Education, Remediation and Basic Skills Education, and Student Services. No overall differences were found for Certificate Programs, Community and Continuing Education, Joint Programs and Transfer Education.

The results of the ANOVAS indicated that there were significant differences in the respondents' rankings within each condition. A Duncan Multiple Range Test revealed significant overall differences for function statements: Associate Degrees, Community Services, General Education, Remediation and Basic Skills Education, Student Services, and Transfer Education. No overall differences were found for Certificate Programs, Continuing and Community Education, and Joint Programs.

#### Associate Degrees.

When responses to function statement one, Associate Degrees, were analyzed concurrently across the three conditions significant differences among the respondents' rankings were indicated. The results of the MANOVA and Fisher's Least Significant Difference Tests for Associate Degrees priority rankings are reported in Tables 9 and 10. There was a significant ( $p < .001$ ) difference in the priority the respondents assigned to Associate Degrees. The results of the Fisher's

Least Significant Difference Test (Table 10) indicated that a significant ( $p < .01$ ) difference existed in the means between the Funding Free and Student Interest conditions and the Funding Free and Funding conditions. Apparently the respondents gave higher priority to

Table 9

Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Priority Rankings of Associate Degree Mission and Goals Statement by Twelve Constituent Groups

$n = 593$

Test Name	Value	Approx F	Hypoth DF	Error DF
Pillais	.12830	2.35972***	33.00	1743.00
Hotellings	.14241	2.49287***	33.00	1733.00
Wilks	.87365	2.42618***	33.00	1706.54
Roy's	.11133			

Variable	Hypoth SS	Error SS	Hypoth MS	Error MS	F
FF	33.35059	2477.63507	3.03187	4.26443	.71097
SI	200.73512	2391.73200	18.24865	4.11658	4.43296***
CF	30.00750	2814.44275	2.72795	4.84414	.56315

\*\*\* $p < .001$

Associate Degrees under the Funding Free condition than under the Student Interest or Funding conditions.

Table 10

Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test for  
Significant Differences Among Associate Degree Mean Ranks  
by Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Conditions

$\bar{x}$	Condition	Condition FF
2.78	Funding Free (FF)	
3.10	Funding (CF)	*
3.29	Student Interest (SI)	*

\* $p < .01$

When responses to Associate Degrees were analyzed within each of the three conditions significant differences among the respondent groups were indicated only under the Student Interest Condition (Table 9). The results of the ANOVA and Duncan Multiple Range Tests for Associate Degrees priority rankings are reported in Tables 11 and 12. There was a small ( $\text{Eta} = .28$ ) but significant ( $p < .0001$ ) difference in the priority the groups assigned to Associate Degrees. Apparently, approximately eight per cent of the variation in the priority rankings can be explained by knowing which of the constituent groups is responding. The results of the Duncan Multiple Range Test (Table 12)

indicated that a significant ( $p < .01$ ) mean difference existed when Student Body Presidents and Directors of EOPS were compared to Chief Business Officers, Affirmative Action Officers, Chief Instructional Officers and President and Superintendents. Apparently the Student Body Presidents and Directors of EOPS gave higher priority to Associate Degrees than the four previously cited groups. In addition, Chief Student Services Officers gave higher priority to Associate Degrees than did Chief Instructional Officers and President and Superintendents. Finally, Public Information Officers gave higher priority to Associate Degrees than did President and Superintendents.

Table 11

Analysis of Variance of Associate Degree Priority Rankings  
in Student Interest Condition by Twelve Constituent Groups

$n = 611$

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	11	208.38	18.94	4.64*
Within Groups	599	2446.13	4.08	
Total	610	2654.52		

\* $p < .0001$

Eta=.28

Table 12

Duncan Multiple Range Test for Significant Differences Among  
Associate Degree Mean Ranks in Student Interest Condition  
by Twelve Constituent Groups

$\bar{x}$	Group	Group			
		SB	DE	DS	PI
2.24	SB				
2.50	DE				
2.81	DS				
3.05	PI				
3.63	BM	*	*		
3.81	AA	*	*		
3.98	DI	*	*	*	
4.29	PS	*	*	*	*

\*p<.01

#### Certificate Programs.

The results of the MANOVA for Certificate Programs are reported in Table 13. Apparently, when priority rankings were analyzed concurrently under the three conditions, no significant differences were found among the twelve respondent groups within each condition or across the three conditions.

Table 13

Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding  
Priority Rankings of Certificate Programs Mission and Goals Statement  
by Twelve Constituent Groups

n = 593

Test Name	Value	Approx F	Hypoth DF	Error DF
Pillais	.07074	1.27554	33.00	1743.00
Hotellings	.07342	1.28517	33.00	1733.00
Wilks	.93048	1.28043	33.00	1706.54
Roy's	.04695			

#### Community Services.

When responses to function statement three, Community Services, were analyzed concurrently across the three conditions, significant differences among the respondents groups were indicated. The results of the MANOVA and Fisher's Least Significant Difference Tests for Community services priority rankings are reported in Tables 14 and 15. There was a significant ( $p < .01$ ) difference in the priority the groups assigned to Community Services. The results of the Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test (Table 15) indicated that a significant ( $p < .01$ ) difference existed in the means between the Student Interest and Funding Free conditions and the Student Interest and Funding conditions. Apparently, the respondents gave higher priority to



Table 14

Analysis of Variance of Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding  
Priority Rankings of Community Services Mission and Goals Statement  
by Twelve Constituent Groups

n = 593

Test Name	Value	Approx F	Hypoth DF	Error DF
Pillais	.10017	1.82450**	33.00	1743.00
Hotellings	.10504	1.83875**	33.00	1733.00
Wilks	.90252	1.83189**	33.00	1706.54
Roys	.06155			

Variable	Hypoth SS	Error SS	Hypoth MS	Error MS	F
FF	54.01072	1247.10058	4.91007	2.14647	2.28750*
SI	42.64396	1496.53733	3.87672	2.57580	1.50506
CF	66.43578	1098.24213	6.03962	1.89026	3.19512***

\*p<.05

\*\*p<.01

\*\*\*p<.001

Community Services under the Student Interest condition than under the  
Funding Free or Funding conditions.

Table 15

Fisher's Least Significant Difference Test for  
Significant Differences Among Community Services Mean Ranks  
by Funding Free, Student Interest, and Funding Conditions

$\bar{x}$	Condition	Condition SI
7.55	Student Interest (SI)	
7.81	Funding Free (FF)	*
7.96	Funding (CF)	*

\* $p < .01$

When responses to Community Services were analyzed within each of the three conditions significant differences among the respondent groups were indicated under the Funding Free and Funding conditions (Table 14). In the Funding Free condition, the results of the ANOVA and Duncan Multiple Range Tests for Community Services priority rankings are reported in Tables 16 and 17. There was a small ( $\text{Eta} = .20$ ) but significant ( $p < .01$ ) difference in the priority the groups assigned to Community Services. Approximately four per cent of the variation in the priority rankings can be explained by knowing which constituent group is responding. The results of the Duncan Multiple Range Test (Table 17) indicated that a significant ( $p < .01$ ) mean difference existed between Student Body Presidents when compared to Directors of EOPS, Chief Student Services Officers, Academic Senate Presidents, President